## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 9-11, 15-18, and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. No. 2001/0040560 to Amron ("Amron").

As required by §102, Amron does not recite all of the elements of amended claim 9. For example, Amron does not recite a "thin, flexible electronic image display device," as recited in amended claim 9. Nothing in the Amron reference describes the device as being flexible. With respect to amended claim 10, Amron does not describe the control circuitry or the power cell as being flexible either.

With respect to claim 15, Amron does not show providing a thin, flexible self-contained electronic image display device, as recited in amended claim 15.

With respect to amended claim 22, Amron does not disclose a sensor device used to detect the proximity of a person. In fact, on page 4 of the Office Action, the examiner states, "Amron...does not disclose sensor means."

With respect to amended claim 25, Amron not show providing a thin, flexible self-contained electronic image display device, as recited in amended claim 25.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 12-14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,021,306 to McTaggart ("McTaggart") in view of Amron. Since the

undersigned believes that the claims from which 12-14 and 20 depend are in condition for allowance, the undersigned believes the rejection of those claims is now moot.

With respect to new claim 27, none of the cited references describe a device that is resiliently deformable.

With respect to new claim 30, neither reference describes the display device being attached to the surface of an associated device.

## Page 16 of 16

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROUSE MCDOWELL** 

Date.

Daniel A. Thomson Reg. No. 43, 189

Customer No. 26871

::ODMA\PCDOCS\BROUSE\667754\1